Quantum Mechanics interpreted in Quantum Real Numbers.

John V Corbett* and Thomas Durt†
()

arXiv:quant-ph/0211180v1 27 Nov 2002

ABSTRACT

The concept of number is fundamental to the formulation of any physical theory. We give a heuristic motivation for the reformulation of Quantum Mechanics in terms of non-standard real numbers called Quantum Real Numbers. The standard axioms of quantum mechanics are re-interpreted. Our aim is to show that, when formulated in the language of quantum real numbers, the laws of quantum mechanics appear more natural, less counterintuitive than when they are presented in terms of standard numbers.

PACS number(s): 03.65

INTRODUCTION

In both classical and quantum physics,the states of a system are represented by mathematical entities (points of the phase-space, wave-functions) that ultimately consist of sets of real numbers. These real numbers are either rational or arbitrarily well approximated by rational numbers. The states are assumed to change in time according to infinitely precise numerical laws, but measurements only determine rational numerical values with finite accuracy. Nonetheless, the accurate experimental confirmation of the numerical predictions of quantum mechanics strongly encourages those who believe in the basic role played by numbers in our universe and in the potential for human beings to know and understand the laws that the numbers obey. However we think that the often unstated assumption, "that the elements of calculation are identical with the elements of observation" [13] is wrong. Our model [1] of quantum real numbers abandons this identification. Other abandonments are well-known, for example, Heisenberg's original paper on quantum mechanics denied the assumption on the grounds that only relations "between observable quantities" [10] can be used. Our model does not adhere to Heisenberg's requirement, on the contrary, in it physical quantities take quantum real numbers as their values even when they are not observed. A more recent model that abandons this identification is the non-commutative geometry [7] model of A. Connes. Compared with it, our model is much less ambitious and requires a less radical change in the picture of the world because in it the values of physical quantities are

*Department of Mathematics,Macquarie University, N.S.W. 2109, Australia, Email address:jvc@ics.mq.edu.au

†TENA, TONA Free University of Brussels, Pleinlaan 2, B-1050 Brussels, Belgium Email, address:thomdurt@vub.ac.be.

given by (commuting) Dedekind real numbers, constructed as cuts in the rational numbers, even though not all quantum real numbers exist to full extent.

As an example consider the position of a particle in a given state at a given time. In the classical description, three real numbers suffice to define the value of the position of a particle; in quantum mechanics, the position of the particle is represented by a triplet of self-adjoint operators. It usually is not acceptable to describe the particle's position by a triplet of numerical values when the particle's state is represented by a wave-function. However it is generally conceded that there is an average value for the position with a probability distribution which is given by the modulus squared of the wavefunction in position space. Thus in the standard quantum mechanical picture a quantum particle is not a material point but is associated with a cloud of probabilities which is spread throughout space. Therefore quantum physics seems to be non-local, an impression that has been confirmed, or at least not contradicted, by all the experiments on Bell's inequalities. Besides non-locality, which is revealed through the EPR paradox, the measurement problem in quantum mechanics is at the source of several paradoxical situations (the Schrödinger cat and the quantum Zeno paradoxes for instance) that clearly illustrate the clash between classical and quantum interpretations and ontologies.

In our view, understanding of the conceptual differences between classical and quantum physics is improved by the recognition that there can be different realisations of real numbers determined by the different theories[1]. To return to the position of a particle, in our model its values are given by a triplet of quantum real numbers, each of which relates, roughly speaking, to a standard real number like a continuous function on an interval does to a point in the interval. We shall give a fuller definition of quantum real numbers later.

We will not develop the quantum real numbers interpretation in a strict axiomatic manner here. We start by accepting the standard Hilbert space mathematical structures that are used in quantum theories but we do not accept their standard interpretation.

Schematically, our work is structured as follows: first the quantum real numbers are defined in basic postulate 0. Then the prototype of a filtering or preparation procedure is taken to be the single slit experiment for the position of a particle. This experiment can be described classically when the quantum real number associated to the position behaves classically in passing through the slit. This is taken to mean that the square of this quantum number must equal the quantum number associated to the square of the position to within the order of a small positive standard real number ϵ. This situation is called the ϵ sharp collimation of the position. If on passing through a slit there is strictly ϵ sharp collimation for the particle's position then Theorem 4 shows that the von Neumann transformation law holds for changes in the quantum real number values of other quantities, up to the same ϵ. A type of Heisenberg inequality for the widths of position and momentum slits is obtained in Theorem 2.

This analysis of the prototype motivates the introduction of the basic postulates of the quantum real number interpretation of quantum mechanics.

---

[1]The logic of the non-standard quantum real numbers is intuitionistic [11]. For a discussion of this aspect of the theory, and for instance, of the reformulation of classical De Morgan's rules, see [1]. The formulation of quantum real numbers in terms of sheaves and toposes is given in [2].

Basic postulate 1 expresses the condition that the statistics of a quantum experiment for any quantity is close to deterministic when the experiment supports strictly ϵ sharp collimation for the values of that quantity.

Next, we reinterpret, in terms of quantum real numbers, an argument due to Goldstone [9,16] and others to show that the statistics relative to repeated measurements performed on identically prepared systems always gives the conventional quantum probability rules. That is, the Born probability rules [19] hold. The proof of Theorem 5 also assumes basic postulate 2 which is equivalent to the quantum ergodic hypothesis. These two basic postulates establish the probabilistic features of arbitrarily prepared quantum systems.

The basic postulates 3A and 3B express the persistence of measured values, thereby restricting the range of application of these postulates. The Luders-von Neumann transformation rule follows in Propositions 2 and 3.

The effect of this class of measurements of quantum real numbers is to refine them to be a sharp quantum number which lie in the interval of standard real numbers defined by the resolution of the measuring apparatus. Therefore in this interpretation the state of a system at a given time can be defined by the set of all the quantum real numbers determined during the preparation/measurement process. This corresponds closely to the classical concept except that quantum real numbers are used instead of standard real numbers.

An example of how a combination of unitary, standard, dynamics and the requirement of measured values to be unambiguously registered (revealed) by a classical apparatus forces the measured values to be almost classical quantum real numbers is proved in Proposition 4.

Next we consider single particle dynamics and the 19th century view that matter is composed of atoms obeying Newtonian dynamics is modified in that the values of the physical quantities are given by quantum real numbers instead of standard real numbers. Basic postulate 4 asserts that the dynamical equations of motion of a quantum system are given by Hamilton/Newton's equations expressed in quantum real numbers. Theorem 6 then asserts that Heisenberg's operator equations of motion when averaged over certain open subsets of state space closely approximate the Newtonian equations for quantum real number defined on these open sets. These open sets do not cover state space so that the approximate equality cannot be extended to the whole of state space.

Finally, we conclude by reformulating some paradoxes in the language of quantum numbers.

I. QUANTUM NUMBERS-THE ONE SLIT EXPERIMENT.

A. Quantum numbers-the basic postulate 0.

Consider a measurement of position. The passage from one to three dimensions does not bring any new insight into the problem, so that we will consider only the measurement of one coordinate of position, let us say, the projection of the position along the Z-axis. Our treatment is not relativistic so that time will always be treated as an external parameter in the following. The position of a classical particle (material point) along the Z-axis is expressed by one standard real number: z.

Let Σ be the set of all density matrices $\hat{\rho}$, where $\hat{\rho}$ is a positive-definite bounded self-adjoint operator on $\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbf{R})$ of trace 1. In conventional quantum mechanics, every particular preparation procedure corresponds to a particular choice or determination of a $\hat{\rho}$ or of a subset of them. A priori, before we prepare the particle, we may be as ignorant of the states $\hat{\rho}$ as we are of the values of the position z of the particle. Nevertheless in our model we assume that the particle has a set of states associated with it at all times, even when we don't know what they are. Furthermore all measurements of the position z yield standard real numbers. We take this to mean that while the position is associated with a self-adjoint operator $\hat{Z}$ on $\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbf{R})$, its values are given by quantum real numbers of the form $z_Q(U)$ with:

$$z_Q(U) \;=\; \{Tr(\hat{\rho}\hat{Z});\; \hat{\rho} \in U\}, \tag{1}$$

where U is an open subset of Σ. The open subsets of Σ are defined by the weakest topology that makes $Tr(\hat{\rho}.\hat{M})$ continuous as a function from Σ to the standard real numbers $\mathbf{R}$ for any linear operator $\hat{M}$ that is self-adjoint and continuous. Here continuous means either bounded on $\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbf{R})$ or continuous in the standard countably normed topology on the Schwartz space $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{R})$. This topology is studied in [2]; we shall call it the standard topology on Σ. Quantum real numbers of the form $z_Q(U)$ are real numbers in the sense of Dedekind [2] [2].

We assume that preparation processes determine open sets U and not single states $\hat{\rho}$.

Thus we impose the following definition of quantum number in the form of a postulate:

Basic postulate 0:

The values of a physical quantity are represented by quantum real numbers of the form $M_Q(U) \;=\; Tr(\hat{\rho}.\hat{M})_{\hat{\rho}\,\in\,U}$, where U is an open subset of the set of density matrices Σ, and $\hat{M}$ is a self-adjoint, continuous linear operator. Furthermore, every physical quantity has a quantum real number value at all times.

Next we consider what happens when we measure the quantum number $Z_Q(U)$ by letting the particle pass through a slit. According to de Broglie every measurement is in the last resort a measurement of position so that this will be a paradigm for the measurement process.

B. The one slit experiment and sharp collimation.

Assume that we can produce particles and prepare them to pass through a rectangular slit in a vertical barrier. We assume that the geometry of the experiment is such that the slit is infinitely extended horizontally. Let us denote by z_1 and z_2 the Z-coordinates of the lower and upper extremities of the slit.

---

[2]Dedekind real numbers are obtained as cuts in the set of rational numbers $\mathbf{Q}$. A cut is a division of $\mathbf{Q}$ into two classes $\mathbf{L}$ and $\mathbf{R}$, with every rational in $\mathbf{L}$ less than every rational in $\mathbf{R}$. When $\mathbf{L}$ does not have a largest member and $\mathbf{R}$ does not have a smallest member the cut defines an irrational number. For the quantum real number $M_Q(U)$, where U is an open subset of Σ and $\hat{M}$ is a self adjoint operator, the cut is defined by sections over subsets W_j of an open cover of U with the rationals $\mathbf{Q_Q}(\mathbf{W_j})$ given by locally constants functions over W. Locally constant functions are constant globally only when defined on a connected set [14,17].

In classical mechanics, particles are assumed to behave as material points and when the preparation is sufficiently accurate it is possible to assign a unique well-defined trajectory to the particle. From the knowledge of its initial position and velocity, one can in principle deduce whether or not the particle will pass through the slit. Positions are thus sharp numbers at each time, where sharpness is a measure of the accuracy of our control and knowledge of the experimental conditions. Obviously, for a classical particle, at the time of the passage through the slit, its position z along the Z-axis lies between z_1 and z_2 .

In the analogous quantum situation, we describe the passage through a slit as a preparation process in terms of quantum numbers. In the following treatment, all values are given at the time of passage through the slit. If W is any open subset of Σ. A W-prepared particle passes through the slit if for all $\hat{\rho}$ in W, $Z_Q(\hat{\rho}) \ = \ Tr(\hat{\rho}.\hat{Z}) \ \in]z_1, \ z_2[$. That is, in terms of the quantum number $Z_Q(W)$, if $Z_Q(W) \ \in]z_1, \ z_2[$.

Furthermore, in classical mechanics, we are free to measure arbitrary functions of the coordinates of the particles. For instance, when z_1 and z_2 are positive numbers, instead of the coordinate z of the particle inside the slit, one could measure its square z^2. In terms of quantum numbers, the situation is ambiguous because, in general, for each $\hat{\rho}$, $(Z_Q)^2(\hat{\rho}) \ = \ Tr^2(\hat{\rho}.\hat{Z})$ differs from $(Z^2)_Q(\hat{\rho}) \ = \ Tr(\hat{\rho}.\hat{Z}^2)$, even when $Z_Q(\hat{\rho}) \ = \ Tr(\hat{\rho}.\hat{Z}) \ \in]z_1, \ z_2[$. We can use the difference between these numbers to measure the departure from classical behaviour, with the parameter $s(Z)$ defined, for each $\hat{\rho}$, as follows:

$$s(Z) \ (\hat{\rho}) \ = \ \sqrt{Tr(\hat{\rho}.\hat{Z}^2) \ - \ Tr^2(\hat{\rho}.\hat{Z})}. \tag{2}$$

The Dedekind number $s(Z)(U)$ is defined pointwise on U. For any open set U, $s(Z)(U)$ has the dimension of a length. We claim that when $s(Z)(U)$ is much smaller than the width of the slit, $Z_Q(U)$ behaves as a standard real number. The dimensionless ratio between $s(Z)(U)$ and the width of the slit $(z_2 \ - \ z_1)$ provides a measure of the departure from classicality that characterizes the passage of a quantum particle through the slit. We introduce the dimensionless standard real number ϵ whose magnitude determines the situations in which the particle's behaviour is nearly classical.

Definition 1: The collimation of a particle through the slit $]z_1, \ z_2[$ is said to be "ϵ sharp" on the open subset U if the value $Z_Q(U)$ of its z-coordinate satisfies both the following conditions:

$$Z_Q(U) \in]z_1, \ z_2[\tag{3}$$

$$z_1 \ \leq \ Z_Q(U) - \ \frac{s(Z)(U)}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} \ < Z_Q(U) + \ \frac{s(Z)(U)}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} \ \leq \ z_2. \tag{4}$$

The inequalities hold pointwise on U.

The following theorem follows from algebraic manipulations of the definitions:

Theorem 1:

When the collimation of a particle through the slit is ϵ sharp on U:

$$\frac{4s(Z)(\hat{\rho})^2}{(z_2 \ - \ z_1)^2} \ = \ 4\frac{Tr(\hat{\rho}.\hat{Z}^2) \ - \ Tr^2(\hat{\rho}.\hat{Z})}{(z_2 \ - \ z_1)^2} \ \leq \ \epsilon, \ \forall \ \hat{\rho} \ \in \ U. \tag{5}$$

That is,

$$\frac{4s(Z)(U)^2}{(z_2 \ - \ z_1)^2} \ \leq \ \epsilon. \tag{6}$$

Therefore if the slit is narrow then $z_Q(U)^2 - (z)^2_Q(U)$ is small. This means that the quantum real number $Z_Q(U)$ can be well approximated by a constant real number in the interval $]z_1, \ z_2[$. If the value of the z coordinate of the particle was measured now it would yield a standard real number in $]z_1, \ z_2[$

When two quantum numbers, corresponding to a position and its conjugate momentum, are simultaneously ϵ-sharp collimated through slits, a lower bound on the product of the widths of the slits is obtained. Since the width of the slit gives a measure of the range of values that could be obtained if the quantities were measured this represents the limitation in accuracy imposed by Heisenberg's uncertainty principle.

Theorem 2

Let z and p represent the position and conjugate momentum of a U-prepared particle, and let $]z_1, \ z_2[$ and $]p_1, \ p_2[$ be the corresponding slits. If the particle is ϵ-sharp collimated through both slits then the product of the widths of the slits must satisfy,

$$|z_2 - z_1||p_2 - p_1| \geq \ 2\hbar/\epsilon \tag{7}$$

Proof:

If the U-prepared particle is ϵ-sharp collimated through both slits then by Theorem 1, $\frac{4s(Z)(\hat{\rho})^2}{(z_2 \ - \ z_1)^2} \ \leq \ \epsilon$, for all $\hat{\rho} \in U$, and $\frac{4s(P)(\hat{\rho})^2}{(p_2 \ - \ p_1)^2} \ \leq \ \epsilon$, for all $\hat{\rho} \in U$. But Heisenberg's inequality states that $s(Z)(\hat{\rho}) \cdot s(P)(\hat{\rho}) \geq \hbar/2$ for all $\hat{\rho} \in U$.

Whence $(z_2 - z_1)^2. \ (p_2 - p_1)^2 \ \geq \ (2\hbar/\epsilon)^2$ as required. #

This result determines the minimum area in the classical phase space that is required if a particle is to be ϵ-sharp collimated in both the z and p variables.

On the assumption that $]z_1, z_2[\cap\sigma(\hat{Z}) \neq \emptyset$,where $\sigma(\hat{Z})$ is the spectrum of $\hat{Z}$," consider $\hat{P}$, the orthogonal projection operator associated to the slit $]z_1, z_2[$ via the spectral family for $\hat{Z}$, $\hat{P} = \hat{E}_{\hat{Z}}(]z_1, z_2[)$ and its corresponding quantum real number $P_Q(U)$ for the open set U.

Theorem 3:

If the collimation of a U-prepared particle through a slit is ϵ sharp, then for each $\hat{\rho}$ in U,

$$Tr(\hat{P} \cdot \hat{\rho}) \ > \ 1 \ - \ \epsilon. \tag{8}$$

In terms of the quantum number $P_Q(U)$,

$$1 \ - \epsilon \ < P_Q(U) \leq 1. \tag{9}$$

Proof:

The essential ingredient of the proof is Chebyshev's inequality of which we shall first recall an elementary derivation.

Let us assume that a random, standard real and positive variable z obeys a normalised distribution given by the function $\mu(z)$ (we assume that μ is sufficiently regular so that all the integrals introduced in the following treatment uniformly converge). Let us denote by $< z >$ the average value of the variable z: $< z > = \ \int_o^\infty d\mu(z) \cdot z$.

Obviously, $< z > \geq \int_\delta^\infty d\mu(z) \cdot z \ \geq \ \delta \cdot \int_\delta^\infty d\mu(z) \ = \ \delta \cdot \mu(z \ \geq \ \delta)$.

Let us consider the variable $(z - < z >)^2$. By the same reasoning, we get that:

$\mu((z - < z >)^2 \ \geq \ \delta^2) \ \leq \ \frac{<z^2> - <z>^2}{\delta^2} \ = \ \frac{\sigma^2}{\delta^2}$,

where σ is the mean square root deviation of the distribution. As a corollary, we get the Chebyshev inequality:

$\frac{\sigma^2}{\delta^2} \ \leq \ \epsilon \Longrightarrow \mu(|z - < z > | \ \geq \ \delta) \ \leq \ \epsilon$.

Let us now make use of Chebyshev's inequality for the open set U of ϵ sharp collimated states. For all $\hat{\rho}$ in U:

$z_1 \ \leq \ Tr(\hat{\rho}.\hat{Z}) \ - \ \frac{s(Z)(\hat{\rho})}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} < \ Tr(\hat{\rho}.\hat{Z}) \ + \ \frac{s(Z)(\hat{\rho})}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} \ \leq \ z_2$.

We can identify $s(Z)$ with σ provided that we identify the spectral measure associated to the quantum number z evaluated at $\hat{\rho}$ with the measure μ introduced in the derivation of Chebyshev's inequality.

Then $Tr(\hat{\rho}.\hat{Z}) \ = < z >$, and $\mu(|z - < z > | \ \geq \ | < z > \ - z_1|) \ \leq \ \epsilon$ as $\frac{\sigma^2}{(<z> \ - \ z_1)^2} \ \leq \ \epsilon$.

We obtain in a similar way that $\mu(|z - < z > | \ \geq \ |z_2 \ - \ < z > |) \ \leq \ \epsilon$ as $\frac{\sigma^2}{(z_2 \ - <z>)^2} \ \leq \ \epsilon$.

This implies that $\mu(z \ \notin \ ]z_1, \ z_2[) \ \leq \ \epsilon$. Therefore in virtue of the normalisation of the spectral measure,

$Tr(\hat{P} \cdot \hat{\rho}) \ = \ \mu(z_1 < z < z_2) \ > \ 1 \ - \ \epsilon$ for all $\hat{\rho}$ in U. #

Intuitively, up to an ϵ, the particle is located inside the slit. We will reformulate this property in terms of probabilities in the next section.

The concept of ϵ sharp collimation is tightened by requiring that $Tr|(\hat{\rho} \ - \ \hat{P} \cdot \hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{P})| \ | < \epsilon$ on the open set U. Here the absolute value of an operator $\hat{A}$ is defined by $| \ \hat{A} \ |= \sqrt{\hat{A}^* \hat{A}}$. This a stronger condition because $Tr|(\hat{\rho} \ - \ \hat{P} \cdot \hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{P})| \geq Tr(\hat{\rho} \ - \ \hat{P} \cdot \hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{P})$, and ϵ sharpness on U implies that $Tr(\hat{P} \cdot \hat{\rho}) \ > (1 - \epsilon)$ holds on U which only implies that $Tr(\hat{\rho} \ - \ \hat{P} \cdot \hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{P}) < \epsilon$ on U. The earlier theorems remain valid for strict ϵ sharpness because the definition requires ϵ sharpness.

Definition 1':

The collimation of a U-prepared particle through a slit is "strictly ϵ sharp" if it is ϵ sharp (Definition 1) and if, for each $\hat{\rho}$ in U, $Tr|(\hat{\rho} \ - \ \hat{P} \cdot \hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{P})| \ | < \epsilon$.

Corollary 1 to Theorem 3:

Let $\hat{\rho}_1$ be the restriction of $\hat{\rho}$ to the slit: $\hat{\rho}_1 = \frac{\hat{P} \cdot \hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{P}}{Tr(\hat{P} \cdot \hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{P})}$. When $\rho \in U$, a set of strictly ϵ sharp collimated states, the difference between $\hat{\rho}_1$ and $\hat{\rho}$ satisfies $Tr \mid \hat{\rho} \ - \ \hat{\rho}_1 \mid < \epsilon \cdot \frac{(2-\epsilon)}{(1-\epsilon)}$.

Proof:

We have that $Tr \mid \hat{\rho} \ - \ \hat{\rho}_1 \mid = Tr \mid \hat{\rho} \ - \ \frac{\hat{P} \cdot \hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{P}}{Tr(\hat{P} \cdot \hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{P})} \mid = Tr|\frac{(Tr(\hat{P} \cdot \hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{P})) \cdot \hat{\rho} \ - \ \hat{P} \cdot \hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{P}}{Tr(\hat{P} \cdot \hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{P})}|$. If we put $\mu = Tr(\hat{P} \cdot \hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{P})$, this can be written as $Tr|\frac{\mu \hat{\rho} \ - \ \hat{P} \cdot \hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{P}}{\mu}| = Tr|\frac{\mu(\hat{\rho} \ - \ \hat{P} \cdot \hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{P} + \ \hat{P} \cdot \hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{P}) - \ \hat{P} \cdot \hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{P}}{\mu}| = Tr|\frac{\mu(\hat{\rho} \ - \ \hat{P} \cdot \hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{P}) + \ (\mu - 1)(\hat{\rho} - \hat{P} \cdot \hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{P})}{\mu}| \leq Tr|(\hat{\rho} - \hat{P} \cdot \hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{P})| + Tr|\hat{P} \cdot \hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{P}| \frac{(\mu - 1)}{\mu}$. Here we used the triangle inequality for the norm $||\hat{A}||_1 = Tr|\hat{A}|$ on the trace class operators. But $|\hat{P} \cdot \hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{P}| = \hat{P} \cdot \hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{P}$ because the latter is a positive, self adjoint operator, and $Tr|(\hat{\rho} \ - \ \hat{P} \cdot \hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{P})| < \epsilon$ because $\rho \in U$, a set of strictly ϵ sharp collimated states. Therefore, $Tr \mid \hat{\rho} \ - \ \hat{\rho}_1 \mid < \ \epsilon \cdot \frac{(2-\epsilon)}{(1-\epsilon)}$

In the last step we used that $(1 - \epsilon) < \mu = Tr(\hat{P} \cdot \hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{P}) = Tr(\hat{P} \cdot \hat{\rho}) \leq 1$ and $\frac{|\mu - 1|}{|\mu|} < \frac{\epsilon}{(1-\epsilon)}$. #

If Z has only one simple eigenvalue in the interval then $\hat{\rho}_1$ is the eigenspace projection.

C. The von Neumann transformation law for quantum numbers.

When the collimation of a particle through the slit is strictly ϵ-sharp, many quantum numbers transforms, up to an ϵ, as if the corresponding operator had undergone a von Neumann transformation. The von Neumann transformation law for a slit with an associated projection operator $\hat{P}$ states that in passing through the slit any operator $\hat{M}$ associated with the particle is changed to $\hat{P}\hat{M}\hat{P}$. The following theorem can be interpreted as saying that the von Neumann transformation law gives a good approximation to the quantum real number value of a quantity associated with a strictly ϵ-sharp collimated particle.

Theorem 4:

If U is an open set of strictly ϵ sharp collimated states for the slit $]z_1, z_2[$, then for all $\hat{\rho}$ in U and for all continuous self-adjoint operators $\hat{M}$,

$$|Tr(\hat{M} \cdot \hat{\rho}) \ - \ Tr(\hat{P}\hat{M}\hat{P} \cdot \hat{\rho})| \ \leq \ m \cdot \epsilon \tag{10}$$

where m is some finite number that depends on $\hat{M}$. That is, on U, the quantum number $M_Q(U)$ is well approximated by the quantum number $(PMP)_Q(U)$

$$|M_Q(U) \ - \ (PMP)_Q(U)| \ \leq \ \ m \cdot \epsilon. \tag{11}$$

Proof:

For any operator $\hat{M}$,

$Tr(\hat{M} - (\hat{P}\hat{M}\hat{P}) \cdot \hat{\rho} = Tr((I-\hat{P})\hat{M}(I-\hat{P}) \cdot \hat{\rho}) + \ Tr((I-\hat{P})\hat{M}\hat{P}) \cdot \hat{\rho}) + Tr(\hat{P}\hat{M}(I-\hat{P}) \cdot \hat{\rho})$.

(a) If M is a bounded self adjoint operator the following estimates hold when $\hat{\rho} \in U$,

$|Tr(\hat{P}\hat{M}(I-\hat{P}) \cdot \hat{\rho})| \leq \ ||\hat{M}|| \cdot Tr|(I-\hat{P}) \cdot \hat{\rho})| < \ ||\hat{M}|| \cdot \epsilon$,

similarly, $|Tr((I-\hat{P})\hat{M}\hat{P} \cdot \hat{\rho})| \leq \ ||\hat{M}|| \cdot Tr|\hat{\rho} \cdot (I-\hat{P})| < \ ||\hat{M}|| \cdot \epsilon$,

and also, $|Tr((I-\hat{P})\hat{M}(I-\hat{P})| < \ ||\hat{M}|| \cdot \epsilon$, where $||\hat{M}||$ is the operator norm of M.

Therefore, for bounded operators the stated inequality holds with $m = 3||\hat{M}||$.

(b) The result can be extended to a wider class of quantities associated with unbounded operators but more care needs to be taken with the topology on Σ with respect to which the operators are continuous [2]. We show that if $\hat{M}$ is the operator $\hat{Z}$ that defines the slit $]z_1, z_2[$, then even when $\hat{Z}$ is unbounded the result holds provided that

$$2 \cdot |z_2 \ - \ z_1| \ \leq \ \epsilon \cdot m, \tag{12}$$

where the constant $m = 2 \cdot min(|z_1|, |z_2|)$.

For example, if $0 \ \leq \ z_1 \ \leq \ z_2$, it is easy to show that, in virtue of Chebyshev's inequality, when $\hat{\rho}$ is in the set U, $(1 - \epsilon) \cdot z_1 \ \leq \ Tr(\hat{P}\hat{Z}\hat{P} \cdot \hat{\rho}) \ \leq \ z_2$. For ϵ sharp collimation, $Tr(\hat{\rho}.\hat{Z}) \ \in \ ]z_1, \ z_2[$. Therefore, $|Tr(\hat{Z} \cdot \hat{\rho}) \ - \ Tr(\hat{P}\hat{Z}\hat{P} \cdot \hat{\rho})| \ \leq \ (z_2 - z_1) + \epsilon \cdot z_1 = (z_2 - z_1) + \epsilon \cdot min(|z_1|, |z_2|) \leq \epsilon \cdot m$ when the condition (12) is satisfied. #

D. Basic Postulate 1.

The usual frequency concept of probability is implicitly present in our description of the one slit experiment when applied to an ensemble of particles. Sometimes a particle passes through the slit and sometimes it is stopped at the barrier because each particle always

has a position given by a quantum real number. When the U-prepared particles are all ϵ sharp collimated and if ϵ approaches zero then $s(Z)(U)$ becomes infinitely smaller than the extension of the slit so the quantum particle should behave like a pointlike particle and pass through the slit with probability one. That is, ϵ sharp collimated quantum numbers approximate, to within ϵ, standard classical numbers in the spectrum of the self-adjoint operator associated with the quantity being collimated. This suggests that the measurable values of a quantum number must belong to the spectrum of the self-adjoint operator.

These considerations recall the philosophy of Niels Bohr in which the measurement process gives an interface between the classical and quantum worlds. In this interface quantum potentialities become actual, a process sometimes called the objectification process. In terms of quantum real numbers, it is a process in which the quantum real numbers become sharp and realise standard, classical values.

Basic Postulate 1:

(i) The measured values of physical quantities always belong to the spectrum of the corresponding self-adjoint operator. (ii) If a quantity is associated with the self-adjoint operator $\hat{M}$ and if U is an open subset of strictly ϵ sharp collimated states for the interval $]m_1, m_2[$ in the spectrum of $\hat{M}$, then the probability that the quantum number $M_Q(U)$ belongs to $]m_1, m_2[$ is larger than $1-\epsilon$.

Note that by Theorem 3, if $\hat{P} = \hat{E}_{\hat{M}}(]m_1, m_2[)$ is the projection operator for the interval $]m_1, m_2[$ then we can identify $P_Q(U) > 1-\epsilon$ as the probability of passing through the slit when U is an open subset of strongly ϵ sharp collimated states for the interval.

There is a special case, when the associated operator M has only one eigenvalue λ in $]m_1, m_2[$ so that $\hat{P}$ is the projection onto the eigenspace for λ and if U is an open set of strongly ϵ sharp collimated states for $]m_1, m_2[$, then the probability that $M_Q(U) = \lambda$ is $P_Q(U) > 1-\epsilon$.

Except in the special case described above there will be many different standard real numbers in the interval that could be realised as the measured value of of the quantity. In a measurement the quantum real number value $M_Q(U)$ of the quantity is forced to realise one of them. We do not know with what probability the different sharp values will occur. Basic postulate 1 gives an estimation of the probability of passage through the slit only in the nearly deterministic regime, i.e., in situations of sharp collimation. In the next section we start to evaluate the probabilities of getting different outcomes in simple cases.

II. DEDUCTION OF THE QUANTUM PROBABILITY LAW.

In the standard quantum mechanics literature the question of whether quantum probability rules like Born's should be postulated independently has been discussed. Several attempts to derive the quantum probability rule by considering many copies of a system and postulating the validity of the eigenstate rule have been made [16]. The eigenstate rule states that if the system was prepared in an eigenstate of a self-adjoint operator $\hat{A}$ then any subsequent measurement of $\hat{A}$ always yields the corresponding eigenvalue.

The eigenstate rule is not equivalent to our first basic postulate. Nevertheless, our first basic postulate implies an modified version of the eigenstate rule in the special case when $\hat{A}$ has only one eigenvalue λ in the interval $]a_1, a_2[$.

If we are content with equality up to an ϵ we can show that the basic postulate 1 implies Born's rule. We shall only sketch the proof in the case of the simplest quantum experiment, a dichotomic experiment, following the treatment given by Goldstone [9] and modified by Squires [16]. A general proof of a similar result was obtained by Busch for observables with a continuous spectrum [6].

We require another postulate, the "ergodic assumption"

Basic Postulate 2 The result of an average measurement performed at the same time on N identical copies of a system and the averaged result of N individual measurements performed successively in time on N identically prepared systems are identically distributed.

Theorem 5: If basic postulates 1 and 2 are satisfied, and the system is prepared in an neighbourhood W of the density matrix $\hat{\rho}_0$, $W = \{\rho | Tr|(\hat{\rho} - \hat{\rho}_0)| < \epsilon\}$ then, up to ϵ, the probability of measuring the outcome i, for $i = 1, 0$, equals $Tr\hat{\rho}_0\hat{P}(i)$, where $\hat{P}(1)$ is the projection operator of the slit and $\hat{P}(0) = 1 - \hat{P}(1)$. That is,

$$|P_Q(i)(W) - Tr(\hat{\rho}_0\hat{P}(i))| < \epsilon. \tag{13}$$

Proof:

Following the notation introduced by Squires [16], we define an "average" operator $\hat{Q}$ constructed to give the average value of a dichotomic quantity, with values 1 or 0, associated to the passage through the slit. On account of this choice of values for the quantity, the average value can be identified with the relative frequency of passage through the slit.

$\hat{Q} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i:\ 1...N} \hat{Q}_i(1)$, where $\hat{Q}_i(1) = \otimes \hat{I}_1 \otimes .... \otimes \hat{P}_i(1) \otimes ... \otimes \hat{I}_N$, an N-fold tensor product with the identity operator in each slot except the ith which contains $\hat{P}_i(1)$. It is easy to check that the spectrum of $\hat{Q}$ goes from 0 to 1 by steps $\frac{1}{N}$. This is due to the fact that the spectrum of each projector $\hat{P}_i(1)$ is equal to $\{0, 1\}$.

We consider N identical copies of the density matrix state $\hat{\rho}_0$, $\hat{\Omega}_0 = \otimes_{j=1}^N \hat{\rho}_0(j)$, of each state $\hat{\rho} \in W$, $\hat{\Omega} = \otimes_{j=1}^N \hat{\rho}(j)$ and of the open set W, $\bar{W} = \prod_{j=1}^N W(j)$.

Now $Tr(\hat{\Omega}_0 \cdot \hat{Q}) = Tr(\hat{\rho}_0 \cdot \hat{P}(1)), \neq 0$ by assumption, $Tr(\hat{\Omega} \cdot \hat{Q}) = Tr(\hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{P}(1))$ and hence $Q_Q(\bar{W}) = P(1)_Q(W) = p(W)$.

Now consider the N-particle projection operators that are a tensor product of J "yes" single particle projections , $\hat{P}_i(1)$, and $(N - J)$ "no" single particle projections, $\hat{P}_i(0)$. By permuting the order of the single particle operators we deduce that for each J there are $\binom{N}{J} = \frac{N!}{J!\ (N-J)!}$ such N-particle operators which represent N-particle measurements in which J particles do, and $(N - J)$ do not, pass through the slit. For any of these N-particle projections $\hat{Q}_J$ and any $\hat{\rho} \in W$,

$Tr(\hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{Q}_J) = (Tr(\hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{P}(1)))^J\ (Tr(\hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{P}(0)))^{(N-J)}$.

Therefore if prepared in the open set W the quantum real number associated to the situation in which J particles do and $(N-J)$ don't pass through the slit is $\binom{N}{J} \cdot (P(1)_Q(W))^J$ $(P(0)_Q(W))^{(N-J)}$.

Now, this is just the expression for the probability of having J favourable and $N - J$ unfavourable events in a Bernouilli process with probabilities $(P(1)_Q(W))$ and $(P(0)_Q(W))$. This is only a formal identification but the expression can be manipulated mathematically.

In the limit as N goes to infinity the Bernouilli (binomial) distribution can be approximated by a Gaussian distribution:

$\binom{N}{J} \cdot p(W)^J\ q(W)^{N-J} \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\, N\, p(W)\, q(W)}} \cdot \exp \frac{-(J - Np(W))^2}{2\, N\, p(W)\, q(W)}$.

Also, the spectrum of $\hat{Q}$ tends to cover the unit interval in this limit and this Gaussian distribution scales to a normal density function for the relative frequency $x = J/N$ given by $\psi(x) = (2\pi p(W)q(W)/N)^{-1/2} \cdot exp - [(x - p(W))^2/(2p(W)q(W)/N)]$. Therefore ψ has mean $< x >= p(W)$ and standard deviation $(p(W)q(W)/N)^{1/2}$.

In virtue of Chebyshev's inequality, $\mu(|x - < x > | \geq \delta) \leq \frac{(p(W)q(W)/N)}{\delta^2}$.

Therefore, since $\psi(x)$ is the probability density function for the relative frequency x, $\mu(|x - < x > | \geq \delta) = 1 - \int_{<x>-\delta}^{<x>+\delta} \psi(x)dx$. On using $\delta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N^{1-\lambda}}}$, with λ a positive standard real number between 0 and 1, the probability of the frequency lying in the interval $[p(W) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{N^{1-\lambda}}},\ p(W) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N^{1-\lambda}}}]$ is larger than 1 - $\frac{p(W)\cdot q(W)}{N^{\lambda}}$ which shows how the relative frequency approaches $p(W)$ in the large N limit.

Suppose that we measure the relative frequency, represented by $\hat{Q}$, with a measuring device of resolution $2R$, which means that we are unable to distinguish values that are less than a distance $2R$ apart. For any realistic device, R can be assumed to be a very small standard real number but is never equal to zero. By choosing N sufficiently large, we can always ensure that the standard deviation $S(Q)(\bar{W}) = (p(W)q(W)/N)^{1/2}$ is much smaller than the resolution $2R$ of the apparatus. Actually, whenever N is larger than $\frac{p(W)\cdot q(W)}{\epsilon\cdot R^2}$ and then $\bar{W}$ is a set of ϵ sharp collimated states for the slit $]p(W) - R,\ p(W) + R[$ for measuring $\hat{Q}$. Therefore by basic postulate 1,for systems prepared in $\bar{W}$ the probability that we observe values of $Q_Q(\bar{W})$ that belong to the interval $]p(W) - R,\ p(W) + R[$ is 1 to within an ϵ. This means that, with probability 1 up to an ϵ, the result of the measurement of $\hat{Q}$ will be equal to $p(W)$ to within the resolution $2R$ of the apparatus.

Now, by basic postulate 2, the averaged result of N individual dichotomic measurements performed successively on N identically prepared systems in the open set W and the results of an average measurement of $\hat{Q}$ performed at the same time on N identical copies of a system in the open set $\bar{W}$ are equally distributed. Since the result of measuring $\hat{Q}$ is almost certainly $p(W)$ in the sense made precise before, we have that in the limit of large N the average value of the individual operator $\hat{P}_i(1)$ is certainly equal to $p(W)$. This average value obtained after N individual measurements is precisely the frequency or probability of obtaining the result "yes" in an individual measurement.

Finally we must show that this result holds uniformly over W. Each density matrix $\hat{\rho}$ in W satisfies $Tr|(\hat{\rho} - \hat{\rho}_0)| < \epsilon$. But, for $i = 0, 1, \hat{P}(i)$ is a bounded operator of norm 1, therefore, $|Tr(\hat{\rho}\hat{P}(i)) - Tr(\hat{\rho}_0\hat{P}(i))| < \epsilon$.

That is, for each $i = 1, 0$, the probability of measuring the outcome i is essentially constant, up to an ϵ, and equal to $Tr(\hat{\rho}_0\hat{P}(i))$ for all density matrices in the neighbourhood W. In terms of the quantum numbers $P(i)_Q(W)$,$i = 1, 0$, $|P(i)_Q(W) - \gamma(i)| < \epsilon$ where the standard real number $\gamma(i) = Tr(\hat{\rho}_0\hat{P}(i))$.

This completes the proof that the basic postulates 1 and 2 are sufficient to derive Born's quantum probability rule because when $\hat{P}(1))$ projects onto the 1 dimensional space spanned by $|1\rangle$ and the state $\hat{\rho}_0$ is pure and equals $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ where ψ is a unit vector then $Tr(\hat{\rho}_0\hat{P}(1))$ equals the Born rule expression, $| \langle\psi|1\rangle |^2$. #

The generalisation of this argument to a finite sequence of dichotomic observations and thus to an arbitrary discretised measurement process is straightforward. If any realistic experiment can only have a finite number of outcomes then we have established the frequency meaning of probability for realistic experiments. We have still to develop dynamical models of how the different outcomes are realised.

It is easy to show that, in virtue of the Theorems 3 and 5, when the collimation of a particle through the slit is ϵ sharp, the particle will pass through the slit with probability equal to 1 (up to an ϵ). This shows the internal consistency of our choice of axioms.

III. PERSISTENCE OF MEASURED VALUES.

Let us return to the single slit experiment as the prototype of a class of measurements in which the measured values persist. In order to guarantee the persistence of the observed values of the positions of the particle, we must impose the following continuity condition: immediately after the particle has passed through the slit, the probability is negligible of finding it elsewhere than in the vicinity of the slit. That is, there exists a standard real number $0 < \epsilon << 1$ and an open set U such that for each $\hat{\rho}$ in U,

$$Tr(\hat{P} \cdot \hat{\rho}) \ > \ 1 \ - \ \epsilon, \tag{14}$$

$\hat{P}$ being the spectral projection for the slit.

Basic Postulate 3 A:

If a quantity $\hat{A}$ is measured and found to have values in the subset I, then there exists a standard real number $0 < \epsilon << 1$ such that immediately after the measurement, the system belongs to the largest open set U on which $Tr|(I - \hat{P}) \cdot \hat{\rho}| \ < \ \epsilon$, $\hat{P}$ being the spectral projector of $\hat{A}$ onto I.

Consequently, in terms of the quantum number $P_Q(U)$,

$$1 \ - \epsilon \ < P_Q(U) \leq 1. \tag{15}$$

Proposition 1:

When the basic postulates 1, 2 and 3 A are satisfied, if a subset I of values of a quantity is measured, then, just after the measurement, the quantum numerical value of the quantity will still belong to I with probability close to one.

Proof:

Let $\hat{A}$ denote the self-adjoint operator of to the quantity being measured and let us assume that the measured values belong to the subset I. The basic postulate 3 A implies that, if $\hat{P}$ is the spectral projection operator for $\hat{A}$ on the subset I, then immediately after the measurement the system is in the set U on which $1 \ - \epsilon \ < P_Q(U) \leq 1$. By a straightforward application of the Born rule, the validity of which was established in theorem 5, this means that the probability that the quantum number $A_R(U)$ belongs to I is greater than $1 \ - \epsilon$.#

We further note that in the limit of vanishing ϵ, any bounded observable $\hat{B}$ transforms according to the von Neumann transformation rule on the open set U because for $\rho \in U$,

$| \, Tr(\hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{B}) \ - \ Tr(\hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{P}\hat{B}\hat{P}) \, | \leq \ ||B|| \cdot \epsilon$.

The proof of this result is the same as that of Theorem 4 which dealt with the case of strictly ϵ sharp collimated states.

Comment:

The persistence/continuity in time of the quantum real number values of the particle's position was implicitly assumed when we described a passage of a particle through a slit in the first section. The persistence, up to an ϵ, of the measured values of a particle's position is based upon experimental facts, exhibited in the setting up of sources and targets and in

bubble chamber pictures when one sees a temporal sequence of aligned excitations, which approximate, up to an ϵ, classical continuous trajectories that exhibit the persistence of localisation.

A. The preparation process as a filtering process.

Note that basic postulate 3A is necessary in order to establish the relevance of basic postulate 1 and of Theorem 5. In order that a state is ϵ sharp collimated, the particle must be physically prepared. Similar preparation of N copies of an open set W is needed in the derivation of the theorem 5. This can be done, in principle, using a combination of dynamical evolutions (that we shall describe in a next section) and filtering processes.

Suppose that during the preparation process different quantities are measured successively. It is well-known that if the quantities are represented by commuting operators, the Birkhoff-von Neumann lattice of physical properties admits a classical (Boolean) representation [5]; this suggests that classical logic describes the logic of the outcomes (up to ϵ). In the standard theory this Boolean representation does not exist for quantities represented by non-commuting operators because the distributivity property of the lattice is violated [5]. A similar conclusion is obtained in axiomatic probability theory, the violation of Bell's inequalities can be shown to reflect the non-existence of a classical probabilistic structure underlying quantum probability [12]. However in the quantum real number model the logic is intuitionistic [1]. If the outcomes of the measurements are given by quantum real number values then, as Theorem 2 shows, if limited accuracy is accepted, quantities represented by non-commuting operators can be measured in succession. The logic of propositions is then intuitionistic but not Boolean in general.To ensure that Boolean logic holds more conditions have to be imposed on the measurements. We will not pursue this discussion further in this paper. Nevertheless, for the registered outcomes of measurements, classical, Boolean logic and probability rules are relevant. Note that, in last resort, it is only through the development of dynamical models of the measurement process that it ought to be possible to connect the quantum and the classical worlds.

In standard quantum mechanics, when observables commute, the temporal order in which they are measured does not affect the statistical distribution of the outcomes[3].Therefore, the outcome observed during the measurement of a quantum number A_Q should persist when another number B_Q is measured provided $\hat{A}$ and $\hat{B}$ commute. This discussion is encapsulated in the following postulate:

Basic Postulate 3 B:

---

[3]For instance, it can be shown that when the system is an entangled bipartite system of which the components belong to regions of space-time separated by a Minkoskian spacelike vector, the quantum statistical correlations between both systems are the same as when these regions are separated by a timelike vector. In the latter case, the chronology of the measurements is invariant under a Lorentz transformation. Otherwise, the temporal order depends on which inertial referential is chosen in order to describe the experiment [18].

Suppose one quantity is measured and found to have values in the subset I and directly afterwards a second quantity is measured. If the quantities are represented by strongly commuting operators $\hat{A}$ and $\hat{B}$ and if $\hat{P}$ is the spectral projector of $\hat{A}$ onto I, then, just after the measurement of $\hat{B}$, the system still belongs to the open set U on which $Tr|(I-\hat{P})\cdot\hat{\rho}| < \epsilon$. Moreover, the temporal order in which $\hat{A}$ and $\hat{B}$ are measured does not affect the statistical distribution of the outcomes.

Note that an alternative approach was proposed elsewhere [3] in order to describe the joint-measurement of the observables $\hat{A}$ and $\hat{B}$, that is known in the litterature as the statistical interpretation. The basic idea is that, being considered that the temporal ordering of the measurement of $\hat{A}$ and $\hat{B}$ does not matter, it is sufficient to consider the global measurement as a whole and to apply the Born rule without considering the possibility of the collapse of the wave function during partial measurements. Logically, this is a consistent approach but according to us it does not answer to the question of the collapse of the full wave function during the global measurement. It also does not explain why regitered outcomes are persistent. The concept of persistence introduced by us in the previous postulates reflects our personal philosophical preference according to which a measurement is a real process. Both views are consistent, exactly in the same way that the violation of local realism by quantum entangled systems can be interpreted as the refutation either of realism or of locality.

Consequence of the Basic Postulates 3 A and B:

If a subset I of values of a quantity $\hat{A}$ is measured, and that, directly afterwards, a subset J of values of a quantity $\hat{B}$ is measured, and that $\hat{A}$ and $\hat{B}$ strongly commute, then, just after the measurement of $\hat{B}$, the system will belong to an open neighbourhood $U \cap V$, with $U = \{\rho : Tr|(I-\hat{P})\cdot\hat{\rho}| < \epsilon\}$ and $V = \{\rho : Tr|(I-\hat{P}')\cdot\hat{\rho}| < \epsilon\}$ where $\hat{P}$ is the spectral projector of $\hat{A}$ onto I and $\hat{P}'$ is the spectral projector of $\hat{B}$ onto J.

From the standard quantum mechanics viewpoint,this looks like the conjunction of propositions being represented, in Boolean logic, by the intersection of the characteristic sets of the propositions[4]. However the sets are open, because the logic is intuitionistic [1].

As a consequence of postulates 3 A and 3B, we can use the language of quantum numbers to describe preparation processes as sequences of filtering processes performed on a particle. The prepared state of the particle is then defined by the set of intervals of quantum real numerical values of the filtered quantities. A new concept of quantum state is derived from this set of intervals. Instead of claiming that a certain state, represented by a density matrix, was prepared, we say that the system underwent a preparation procedure during which certain quantum numbers were prepared. This provides us with an operational definition of the state of a quantum system in terms of quantum numbers.

The equivalence between preparation and measurement for the class of processes in which measured values persist allows the passage from the standard interpretation of quantum

---

[4]This analogy with classical logics in the case of commuting observables is also valid for what concerns the logical implication, which corresponds to the set-theoretical inclusion relation in Boolean representations. For instance, it is easy to deduce from the definition 1 that, when a system is ϵ sharp collimated relatively to a slit of breadth $z_2 - z_1$, it will certainly (up to an ϵ) pass through a parallel and non-distant larger slit of breadth $\tilde{z}_2 - \tilde{z}_1$ (with $\tilde{z}_2 - \tilde{z}_1 > z_2 - z_1$) the center of which is aligned with the center of the first slit.

theory to that of quantum real numbers in which physical quantities always have quantum numerical values that exist to extents given by open subsets of Σ. However it is only when the measured quantum real numbers approximate standard real numbers closely, that is, when they are ϵ sharp collimated, and persist, that they become concrete, recordable facts.

The fact that the observed outcomes of a measurement persist makes it possible to define more accurately the transformation undergone by the quantum real numbers during the measurement process.

B. The Luders-von Neumann transformation rule.

In the standard quantum theory, the collapse hypothesis is often given as an independent postulate governing the behaviour of systems under measurement. It states that if the system was prepared as the density matrix $\hat{\rho}_0$,then during the measurement $\hat{\rho}_0$ "collapses" to $\rho_0' = \frac{\hat{P}\cdot\hat{\rho}_0\cdot\hat{P}}{Tr(\hat{P}\cdot\hat{\rho}_0)}$, where $\hat{P}$ is the projection operator of the slit. Then any observable $\hat{B}$ transforms, in the Heisenberg picture, according to the Luders-von Neumann transformation rule, in which $\hat{B}$ is changed to $\frac{\hat{P}\cdot\hat{B}\cdot\hat{P}}{Tr(\hat{P}\cdot\hat{\rho}_0)}$.

This transformation rule differs from the von Neumann rule which says that in similar circumstances $\hat{B}$ is changed to $\hat{P}\cdot\hat{B}\cdot\hat{P}$. The difference is due to the fact that for the von Neumann transformation the preparation of the initial state of the particle includes the process of collimation through the slit, while the preparation of the initial state for the Luders-von Neumann transformation does not. This distinction is emphasised in the two next propositions.

Proposition 2 (Luders-von Neumann rule)

Assume that a system is initially prepared in the open set W of states centered on the state $\hat{\rho}_0$: $W = \{\hat{\rho} \in \Sigma : Tr|(\hat{\rho} - \hat{\rho}_0)| < \delta\}$. Next assume that during the preparation of the initial state the quantity $\hat{A}$ is measured/prepared with values in the interval I. Then any quantity associated with a bounded self-adjoint operator$\hat{B}$ has a quantum real number value given approximately by the constant standard real number $Tr\hat{\rho}_0'\cdot\hat{B}$, where $\hat{\rho}_0' = \frac{\hat{P}\cdot\hat{\rho}_0\cdot\hat{P}}{Tr(\hat{\rho}_0\cdot P)}$.

Here $\hat{P}$ is the spectral projection operator for $\hat{A}$ on the interval I and $\hat{P}\cdot\hat{\rho}_0 \neq \hat{0}$. The approximation is governed by the preparation parameter δ and the persistence parameter ϵ.

Proof:

After the measurement of the quantity $\hat{A}$, the system belongs to an open set U defined in the basic postulate 3 A, on which $Tr|(\hat{I}-\hat{P})\cdot\hat{\rho}| < \epsilon$, where $\hat{P}$ is the spectral projection of $\hat{A}$ onto I. By assumption, the initial preparation is also described by the open set W so that for any $\hat{\rho} \in W \cap U$,

$$Tr|(\hat{\rho} - \hat{\rho}_0')| = Tr|(\hat{\rho} - \hat{\rho}_0 + \hat{\rho}_0 - \hat{\rho}_0')| \leq Tr|(\hat{\rho} - \hat{\rho}_0)| + Tr|(\hat{\rho}_0 - \hat{\rho}_0')| \tag{16}$$

The first term is less than δ because $\hat{\rho} \in W$.

The second is less than $\epsilon\cdot(2-\epsilon)/(1-\epsilon)$ by Corollary 1 to Theorem 3 (the proof of which is still valid under the present assumptions).

Thus

$$Tr|(\hat{\rho} - \hat{\rho}_0')| < \delta + \epsilon\cdot(2-\epsilon)/(1-\epsilon). \tag{17}$$

Therefore if ϵ and δ are small enough the measured value of the quantity with bounded operator $\hat{B}$ will be given to a good approximation by the constant number $Tr\hat{\rho}'_0 \cdot \hat{B}$, as predicted by the Luders-von Neumann transformation. #

Note that in the previous proposition, we assumed that a particular value of the first quantity $\hat{A}$ was measured during the preparation process. The next proposition establishes the Luders-von Neumann rule when the preparation process is assumed to end before the measurement of the first quantity $\hat{A}$.

Proposition 3 (extended Luders-von Neumann rule)

Suppose the system has been prepared initially in an open set W of extension ϵ around the density matrix $\hat{\rho}_0$. If $\hat{A}$ is then measured, found to have values in the interval $I(i)$,$i = 1, ..., N$,and if $\hat{P}_i$, the spectral projection of A for $I(i)$, satisfies $\hat{P}_i \cdot \hat{\rho}_0 \neq 0$, then immediately after the measurement, the system will belong to an open set $W'(i)$ of extension ϵ around the density matrix $\rho'_0(i) = \frac{\hat{P}_i \cdot \hat{\rho}_0 \cdot \hat{P}_i}{Tr(\hat{P}_i \cdot \hat{\rho}_0)}$.

Accordingly, the quantum real number associated to any bounded self-adjoint operator $\hat{B}$ that strongly commutes with $\hat{A}$ transforms as follows: $B_Q(W) - - > B_Q(W'(i))$

Proof of the Proposition 3.

Consider two strongly commuting self-adjoint operators $\hat{A}$ and $\hat{B}$. To simplify the notation, we suppose that both operators are bounded and that $\hat{A} = \Sigma_{i=1}^N a_i \cdot \hat{P}_i$ where $a_i \in \mathbf{R}$, $N < \infty$, and $\hat{P}_i$ is the projection onto the eigenvalue a_i. Given postulate 3 B the outcomes of measurements performed on $\hat{A}$ persist during measurements of $\hat{B}$ when $\hat{A}$ and $\hat{B}$ commute so that we can decompose the measurement of $\hat{A} \cdot \hat{B}$ into the measurement of $\hat{A}$ alone followed by the measurement of $\hat{B}$. In virtue of the last part of the postulate 3 B, the probabilistic predictions that we derive from the Born rule will be the same whether we measure the quantity $\hat{A} \cdot \hat{B}$ as a single quantity or we measure $\hat{A}$ and $\hat{B}$ sequentially.

Let the open set $W = \{\hat{\rho} \in \Sigma : Tr|\hat{\rho} - \hat{\rho}_0| < \epsilon\}$ be given, where $\hat{\rho}_0$ satisfies

$$\hat{\rho}_0 \cdot \hat{P}_i \neq 0, \tag{18}$$

for each $\hat{P}_i$ in the spectral decomposition of $\hat{A}$.

For any $\hat{\rho} \in W$,

$$Tr(\hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{A} \cdot \hat{B}) = Tr(\hat{\rho} \cdot \Sigma_{i=1}^N a_i \cdot \hat{P}_i \cdot \hat{B}) = \Sigma_{i=1}^N a_i \cdot Tr(\hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{P}_i \cdot \hat{B}) \tag{19}$$

But

$$|Tr(\hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{P}_i \cdot \hat{B}) - Tr(\hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{P}_i \cdot \hat{B} \cdot \hat{P}_i)| = 0. \tag{20}$$

because $\hat{A}$ and $\hat{B}$ strongly commute, so that

$$|Tr(\hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{A} \cdot \hat{B}) - \Sigma_{i=1}^N a_i \cdot Tr(\hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{P}_i \cdot \hat{B} \cdot \hat{P}_i)| = 0 \tag{21}$$

Now since $\hat{\rho}_0$ was chosen so that $\hat{P}_i \cdot \hat{\rho}_0 \neq 0$ for any i,

$$\Sigma_{i=1}^N a_i \cdot Tr(\hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{P}_i \cdot \hat{B} \cdot \hat{P}_i) = \Sigma_{i=1}^N a_i \cdot Tr(\hat{\rho}_0 \cdot \hat{P}_i) \cdot \frac{Tr(\hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{P}_i \cdot \hat{B} \cdot \hat{P}_i)}{Tr(\hat{\rho}_0 \cdot \hat{P}_i)} \tag{22}$$

for all $\rho \in W$. By Theorem 5, for all $\rho \in W$, $Tr|(\hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{P}_i) - (\hat{\rho}_0 \cdot \hat{P}_i)| < \epsilon$ so that $|Tr(\hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{P}_i \cdot \hat{B} \cdot \hat{P}_i) - Tr(\hat{\rho}_0 \cdot \hat{P}_i \cdot \hat{B} \cdot \hat{P}_i)| < \epsilon \cdot ||\hat{B}||$. Thus to within an error that goes to 0 with ϵ, for all $\rho \in W$, $Tr(\hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{A} \cdot \hat{B}) = \Sigma_{i=1}^N a_i \cdot Tr(\hat{\rho}_0 \cdot \hat{P}_i) \cdot \frac{Tr(\hat{\rho}_0 \cdot \hat{P}_i \cdot \hat{B} \cdot \hat{P}_i)}{Tr(\hat{\rho}_0 \cdot \hat{P}_i)}$.

Theorem 5 permits us to approximate the term $Tr(\hat{\rho}_0 \cdot \hat{P}_i)$ by $(P_i)_Q(W)$. We now use the permutation property of the trace to rewrite $\frac{Tr(\hat{\rho}_0 \cdot \hat{P}_i \cdot \hat{B} \cdot \hat{P}_i)}{Tr(\hat{\rho}_0 \cdot \hat{P}_i)} = Tr\hat{\rho}'_0(i) \cdot \hat{B}$, where $\hat{\rho}'_0(i) = \frac{\hat{P}_i \cdot \hat{\rho}_0 \cdot \hat{P}_i}{Tr(\hat{\rho}_0 \cdot \hat{P}_i)}$ is the Luders-von Neumann transformed of $\hat{\rho}_0$ when the outcome a_i has been measured.Thus, for all $\rho \in W$, $Tr(\hat{\rho} \cdot \hat{A} \cdot \hat{B})$ is well approximated by a sum that is independent of $\rho \in W$. By basic postulate 3B the statistical distribution of the outcomes $a_i \cdot b_j$ is independent of whether the quantities of A and B were measured simultaneously or sequentially.

This result can be written in terms of quantum numbers, if $W = \{\rho; Tr|\rho - \rho_0| < \epsilon\}$ and $W'(i) = \{\rho; Tr|\rho - \rho'_0(i)| < \epsilon\}$ where $\rho'_0(i) = \frac{\hat{P}_i \cdot \hat{\rho}_0 \cdot \hat{P}_i}{Tr(\hat{P}_i \cdot \hat{\rho}_0)}$,then

$$(A \cdot B)_Q(W) \approx \Sigma_{i=1}^{N} A_Q(W'(i)) \cdot (P_i)_Q(W) B_Q(W'(i)) \tag{23}$$

That is, the value of $(A \cdot B)_Q$ at W equals the sum over i of the products of the values of A_Q and B_Q at $W'(i)$ weighted by the probability $(P_i)_Q$ at W to an approximation that depends on the precision of the initial preparation. Note that this result is valid in general, even when $\hat{P}_i \cdot \hat{\rho}_0 = 0$ for some i. #

Remark:

In the quantum numbers interpretation, we claim on the basis of the results of the previous subsection that if the measurement of the quantum number A_Q involves filtering through a slit $I(i)$ then any quantity whose corresponding operator commutes with $\hat{A}$ behaves, up to an ϵ, as if it had undergone a Luders-von Neumann transformation. Note that this does not imply that the collapse process really occurs, but rather that the collapse postulate gives a good approximation to the quantum numbers obtained in this type of measurement. Nevertheless, the change undergone during the measurement process cannot be described solely by a unitary evolution (this is the core of the so-called measurement problem) as shows the following example.

C. An example of measurement of position

The following example shows that when a particle is sharply localised in space, and that a pointer interacts with this particle according to a well chosen interaction (in this case an impulsive von Neumann interaction Hamiltonian), the pointer reveals unambiguously the position of the particle. In this example, the apparatus being located in classical space time can only register (reveal) unambiguously numbers that are approximately classical.

Assume that the system is represented by particle 1, the measuring apparatus by particle 2. They will be treated as quantum systems with associated Hibert spaces $\mathcal{H}(\infty)$ and $\mathcal{H}(\in)$, while the combined two particle system has the tensor product Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}(\infty, \in) = \mathcal{H}(\infty) \otimes \mathcal{H}(\in)$. The corresponding state spaces are $\Sigma(1)$, $\Sigma(2)$ and $\Sigma(1,2)$. When $W(1)$ is an open set in $\Sigma(1)$ and $W(2)$ is open in $\Sigma(2)$, we define the superset $W(1,2)$ of $W(1)$ and $W(2)$ to be the smallest open set in $\Sigma(1,2)$ such the partial traces $Tr_{\mathcal{H}(\infty)}\rho(1,2) \in W(2)$ and $Tr_{\mathcal{H}(\in)}\rho(1,2) \in W(1)$ for all $\rho(1,2) \in W(1,2)$.

Initially particle 1 is prepared so that the quantum real number value of its position is $X(1)_Q(W(1))$ where $W(1) \supset U(1) \cup V(1)$. The open sets $U(1)$ and $V(1)$ are such that the quantum real number values $X(1)_Q(U(1))$ and $X(1)_Q(V(1))$ of the particle's position make it ϵ sharp collimated in one of the two slits in the screen. If the slits are determined by the

classical numbers $a < b < c < d$ as $I_1 =]a, b[$ and $I_2 =]c, d[$ then $a < X(1)_Q(U(1)) < b < c < X(1)_Q(V(1)) < d$. Clearly $U(1) \cap V(1) = \emptyset$. Let $\hat{P}_1$ and $\hat{P}_2$ be the projection operators for the slits I_1 and I_2.

Particle 2 is prepared with position $X(2)_Q(W(2))$ which is classical or approximately classical,

$$[S_{X(2)}(W(2))]^2 = |(X(2)_Q(W(2)))^2 - (X(2)^2)_Q(W(2))| < \epsilon_2, \tag{24}$$

where ϵ_2 is a very small positive standard real.

Now particles 1 and 2 interact through an impulsive von Neumann interaction Hamiltonian $H(1,2)_Q(U(1,2)) = g \cdot [X(1) \cdot \mathcal{P}(\in)]_Q(\mathcal{U}(\infty, \in))$ defined on the open subset $U(1,2)$ of $\Sigma(1,2)$. Here $\mathcal{P}(\in)$ is the self adjoint operator for the momentum of particle 2, $\hat{X}(1)$ is that for the position of particle 1 and g is the coupling constant that is such that $g \cdot \Delta t$ is finite for the infinitesimal period, Δt, during which the force acts. The solution of the Hamiltonian equations of motion for this Hamiltonian reveals that when the interaction has ceased the position of particle 2 has changed by an amount $g \cdot \Delta t \cdot X(1)_Q(O)$, where O is an open subset of $\Sigma(1)$.

Proposition 4

The final position of particle 2 is approximately classical if O is either an open subset of $U(1)$ or an open subset of $V(1)$ such that $X(1)_Q(O)$ is almost classical. However, if $O = U(1) \cup V(1)$ then the final position of particle 2 is not approximately classical which means that when particle 1's quantum position covers both slits it is not registered by the measurement particle 2.

Proof:

The final position of particle 2 is $X(2)_Q(W(2)) + g \cdot \Delta t \cdot X(1)(O)$ which we will call $X(2)_f$, the corresponding operator is $\hat{X}(2)_f = \hat{I}(1) \otimes \hat{X}(2) + g \cdot \Delta t \ \hat{X}(1) \otimes \hat{I}(2)$ and let $O(1,2)$ be the super set of $W(2)$ and O.

Start by assuming that $O = U(1)$ is such that $X(1)_Q(U(1))$ is approximately classical, then $[S_{X(2)_f}(O(1,2))]^2 = [S_{X(2)}(W(2))]^2 +$

$(g \cdot \Delta t)^2 [S_{X(1)}(U(1))]^2 + 2g \cdot \Delta t(-X(1)_Q(U(1)) \cdot X(2)_Q(W(2)) + (\hat{X}(1) \otimes \hat{X}(2))(O(1,2)))$.

The right hand side is small if both $X(2)_Q(W(2))$ and $X(1)_Q(U(1))$ are approximately classical, since the first two terms are, by definition, and the third term is also small because approximately classical quantum numbers are approximately homothetic,i.e., $X(2)_Q(W(2)) \approx x_2 I_Q(W(2))$ and $X(1)_Q(U(1)) \approx x_1 I_Q(U(1))$ where x_1 and x_2 are standard real numbers.

The same argument works if $U(1)$ replaces $V(1)$. Similar arguments work when,for example, $X(1)_Q(W(1))$ is not approximately classical but there is an open set $O \subset W(1)$ so that $X(1)_Q(O)$ is. However the argument does not work when $O = U(1) \cup V(1)$ because in that case $X(1)_Q(O)$ is not approximately classical, i.e., $[S_{X(1)}(O)]^2$ is not small. If a measurement of position would occur, then, according to the basic postulate 3 A, $\hat{X}(2)_f$ ought to become concentrated around the value that gets registered during the process and $[S_{X(2)_f}(O(1,2))]^2$ would then be small. Therefore no persistent registration is likely to occur when $O = U(1) \cup V(1)$. Note that a similar result occurs if O is centered around say a fifty-fifty coherent superposition of states that belong to $U(1)$ and $V(1)$. #

This model result implies that the quantum particle 1 may pass through both slits simultaneously but such events are not unambiguously revealed (or persistently registered)

by the measurement particle 2 because then the position of particle 2 is not even approximately classical. Nevertheless, this example shows that it is not impossible to reintroduce in the quantum numbers approach the counterpart of classical objectivity provided somewhere inside the chain of measurements that separates the quantum system and the observer, a device is classical, so to say, a quantity $\hat{A}$ is measured and found to have (persistent) values in the subset I. The question to know precisely at which level of the chain such a classical measurement apparatus is present is in last resort a question of personal interpretation. If I can be considered to be a sharp subset, relatively to subsequent measurement devices similar to the one described in the previous section, all of them will reveal unambiguously values contained inside I and their result will be consistent with those associated to $\hat{A}$.

What we cannot explain at this level, and this is the deep mystery of quantum mechanics, the essence of the yet unsolved measurement problem, is how quantum numbers become sharp. This objectification process, or "collapse" process ought in principle to be due simply to the interaction between the system and the measurement apparatus but such a process, during which superpositions are broken is not consistent with the unitarity of Heisenberg-Schrödinger evolution as we have shown. This point will be briefly discussed in the conclusions.

At least, the measurment problem suggests that it is worth investigating non-standard (non-unitary) dynmical laws. This will be done in the next section, where we propose (speculatively) a new type of dynamics. We shall assume that quantum particles obey the simplest generalisation of classical dynamics that can be derived on the assumption that quantities take quantum real number values.

IV. QUANTUM DYNAMICS WITH QUANTUM REAL NUMBERS.

In the first section, we introduced sharply collimated particles as a heuristic example which helped to motivate the choice of the basic postulates 1 and 2. These particles can be considered to be classical in the sense that they behave like localised pointlike particles with regard to passing or not through a slit. In this section, open subsets of Σ containing sharply collimated particles are used to show that the unitary quantum mechanical evolution laws give good approximations to quasi-classical dynamical laws expressed in quantum real numbers. The set Σ of density matrices is restricted so that the unbounded position and momentum operators, $\hat{Q}_j$ and $\hat{P}_j$, of the Schrödinger representation of the canonical commutation relations give quantum real numbers as continuous functions on Σ [2].

Basic Postulate 4 (tentative)

Consider the example of a non-relativistic quantum particle of positive mass μ that moves in a central force field F which is derived from a potential function V. We assume that the quantum values $(Q_j)_Q$ of the position coordinates and $(P_j)_Q$ of the conjugate momenta of the particle globally satisfy equations of motion that resemble the equations of classical mechanics. That is, the global quantum numbers $(Q_j)_Q$ and $(P_j)_Q$ satisfy Hamilton's equations. Thus, $\mu \frac{d(Q_j)_Q(U)}{dt} = (P_j)_Q(U)$ and $\frac{d(P_j)_Q(U)}{dt} = F_j(\vec{Q}_Q(U))$ hold for all open subsets $U \in \Sigma$, where $\frac{d}{dt}$ denotes differentiation with respect to time, F_j represents the the jth component of the force. F_j is the jth component of the negative gradient, $-\nabla V$, of the scalar potential function $V(\vec{Q}_Q)$ where $\vec{Q}_Q = ((Q_1)_Q, (Q_2)_Q, (Q_3)_Q))$.

This means that for all $\rho \in \Sigma$, $\mu \frac{dTr(\hat{Q}_j\hat{\rho})}{dt} = Tr(\hat{P}_j\hat{\rho})$ and $\frac{dTr(\hat{P}_j\hat{\rho})}{dt} = F_j(Tr(\hat{Q}\hat{\rho}))$

We will sometimes use Newton's equations which are, in terms of the $(Q_j)_Q(\Sigma)$, $\mu \frac{d^2((Q_j)_Q(\Sigma))}{dt^2} = F_j(Q_Q(\Sigma))$. Again this means that for all $\rho \in \Sigma$, $\mu \frac{d^2(Tr(\hat{Q}_j\hat{\rho})}{dt^2}) = F_j(Tr(\hat{Q}\hat{\rho}))$.

An inverse to Ehrenfest's Theorem

We will now prove a theorem that states that if basic postulate 4 holds then the self-adjoint operators $\hat{Q}_j$ and $\hat{P}_j$ satisfy equations that well approximate Heisenberg's operator equations of motion when localised to certain open subsets of Σ. To simplify the notation we will assume that the particle is one dimensional.

The theorem relates a set of operator equations, Heisenberg's equations, to a set of quantum real number equations, Newton's equations so we have first to explain what approximate equality between them means. A straightforward way to get a quantum real number equation from an operator equation is to multiply each side of the operator equation by a density operator, ρ, and then take the trace of each side. The original operator equation becomes a family of numerical equations which can be localised in an open subset of Σ by restricting the ρ's to belong to the subset.

Recall that Heisenberg's equations for an operator $\hat{A}$ are

$\frac{d\hat{A}}{dt} = -i[\hat{A}, \hat{H}]$

where $\hat{H}$ is the Hamiltonian operator of the system and the square bracket denotes the operator commutator. For the one dimensional motion, the Hamiltonian operator is

$\hat{H} = \frac{1}{(2\mu)}\ \hat{P}^2 + V(\hat{Q})$.

To simplify the discussion we remove the explicit dependence of the equations on the momentum operator $\hat{P}$ and just use Newton's equations of motion in the form of second order differential equations. If Newton's quantum real number equations hold to the extent W, then for all $\hat{\rho}$ in W,

$\mu \frac{d^2(Tr(\hat{Q}\hat{\rho})}{dt^2}) = F(Tr\hat{\rho}\hat{Q})$.

If Heisenberg's numerical equations hold to the extent W, then for all $\hat{\rho}$ in W

$\mu \frac{d^2(Tr(\hat{Q}\hat{\rho})}{dt^2}) = Tr\hat{\rho}\hat{F}(Q)$.

The difference between the right hand sides of these equations shows why Ehrenfest's Theorem is not valid for all functions F. In general,

$Tr\hat{\rho}\hat{F}(Q) \neq F(Tr\hat{\rho}\hat{Q})$. Note that in principle this difference is experimentally testable, which shows that the quantum real number approach to quantum mechanics is not purely ad hoc.

It is possible, however, that the difference between the two sides is small at some state $\hat{\rho}_a$ and remains small in an open neighborhood of $\hat{\rho}_a$. Then the equations are approximately equal on that open set. This will be taken to mean that Heisenberg's numerical equations give a good approximation to Newton's equation in that neighbourhood. We claim that for a suitable class of functions F, this is true in the vicinity of every point on the position line of the one dimensional model. That is, for every standard real number r and standard real number $\epsilon > 0$, we can find an open set, $W(r, \epsilon)$ in Σ, such that, both

(a) the quantum real number $Q_Q(W(r, \epsilon))$ is arbitrarily close to r, and

(b)for each $\hat{\rho}$ in $W(r, \epsilon)$, $Tr\hat{\rho}\hat{F}(Q)$ is arbitrarily close to $F(Tr\hat{\rho}\hat{Q})$.

The physical interpretation is that if an observer's measurement apparatus is located in the immediate vicinity of the position r then the observer cannot measure any significant difference between the accelerations of the particle due to the two forces, $Tr\hat{\rho}\hat{F}(Q)$ and

$F(Tr\hat{\rho}\hat{Q})$. The unitary evolution of quantum mechanics gives a local linear approximation to the equations of classical mechanics expressed in quantum real numbers.

The class of suitable functions is defined through the concept of $\mathcal{S}$-continuity.

Definition 3:

A function F is $\mathcal{S}$-continuous, if it is real-valued continuous functions of a real variable such that, for the position operator $\hat{Q}$, $F(\hat{Q})$ defines an operator on the Schwartz space $\mathbf{S}$ that is continuous in the standard countably normed topology on $\mathbf{S}$.

The class of $\mathcal{S}$-continuous functions includes all polynomials [2].

Theorem 6:

If the force F is $\mathcal{S}$-continuous, then given $\epsilon > 0$, Heisenberg's equations of motion approximate Newton's equations of motion to within ϵ on each member of a collection of open sets $W(r, \epsilon)$ of Σ, indexed by the standard real numbers r and ϵ. That is, for all $\hat{\rho}$ in $W(r, \epsilon)$,

$|Tr\hat{\rho}\hat{F}(Q) - F(Tr\hat{\rho}\hat{Q})| < \epsilon$.

Proof:

The idea behind the proof is to find states ρ_r at which $F(Tr\hat{\rho}_r\hat{Q})$ closely approximates $Tr\hat{\rho}_r\hat{F}(Q)$, then $F(Tr\hat{\rho}\hat{Q})$ will be close to $Tr\hat{\rho}\hat{F}(Q)$ for all $\hat{\rho}$ that are such that both $F(Tr\hat{\rho}\hat{Q})$ is close to $F(Tr\hat{\rho}_r\hat{Q})$ and $Tr\hat{\rho}\hat{F}(Q)$ is close to $Tr\hat{\rho}_r\hat{F}(Q)$. To achieve this we must first construct the open sets $W(r, \epsilon)$.

Definition 4:

Given F,r and ϵ, $W(r, \epsilon) = N(\hat{\rho}_r, \hat{Q}, \delta) \cap N(\hat{\rho}_r, \hat{F}(Q), \frac{\epsilon}{3})$, where, δ is given by $|F(r) - F(x)| < \frac{\epsilon}{6}$ if $|r - x| < \delta$ (δ depends upon both ϵ and r) and ρ_r satisfies both $|Tr\hat{\rho}_r\hat{F}(Q) - F(r)| < \frac{\epsilon}{6}$ and $|Tr\hat{\rho}_r\hat{Q} - r| < \frac{\delta}{2}$.

That such density operators ρ_r exist follows from Weyl's criterion [15].

Lemma 1:

If Q is a self-adjoint operator which has absolutely continuous spectrum, then for any real number r in its spectrum we can construct a sequence of pure states $\hat{\rho}_n$ such that, for the given S-continuous function F, $Tr\hat{\rho}_n\hat{F}(Q)$ approaches $F(r)$ and $Tr\hat{\rho}_n\hat{Q}$ approaches r, as n approaches infinity.

Proof:

From Weyl's criterion [15] it follows that, for any number r in the spectrum of $\hat{Q}$, there exists a sequence of unit vectors $\{u_n\}$, in the domain of $\hat{Q}$, such that if $\hat{\rho}_n$ is the projection onto the one dimensional subspace spanned by the vector u_n then $Tr\hat{\rho}_n\hat{Q}$ approaches r as $n \to \infty$.

The vectors $\{u_n\}$ can be chosen to be in $\mathbf{S}$. Furthermore we can find a sequence of vectors $\{u_n\} \in \mathbf{S}$ such that for n large enough the support of u_n lies in a narrow interval centred on r. Then, the corresponding one dimensional projection operators $(\hat{\rho}_n)$, are such that the sequence of standard real numbers $Tr\hat{\rho}_n\hat{F}(Q)$ approaches $F(r)$ by S-continuity, and the sequence of standard real numbers $Tr\hat{\rho}_n\hat{Q}$ approaches r by the spectral theorem for Q. #

From Lemma 1, once we are given a real number r in the spectrum of Q, the $\mathcal{S}$-continuous function F and a real number $\epsilon > 0$, we can find an integer N such that, for all $j > N$, both $|Tr\hat{\rho}_j\hat{F}(Q) - F(r)| < \frac{\epsilon}{6}$ and $|Tr\hat{\rho}_j\hat{Q} - r| < \frac{\delta}{2}$ where δ is given in Definition 4.

We choose $\hat{\rho}_r = \hat{\rho}_j$, for some $j > N$, and deduce that

$|Tr\hat{\rho}_r\hat{F}(Q) - F(Tr\hat{\rho}_r\hat{Q})| < \frac{\epsilon}{3}$

because
$|Tr\hat{\rho}_r\hat{F}(Q) - F(Tr\hat{\rho}_r\hat{Q})|$
$\leq |Tr\hat{\rho}_r\hat{F}(Q) - F(r)| + |F(r) - F(Tr\hat{\rho}_r\hat{Q})|$.
With this choice of ρ_r, the construction of the open set $W(r,\epsilon)$ is completed.

Proof of Theorem 6, (continued):

For all $\rho \in W(r,\epsilon)$ we have
$|Tr\hat{\rho}\hat{F}(Q) - F(Tr\hat{\rho}\hat{Q})|$
$\leq |Tr\hat{\rho}\hat{F}(Q) - Tr\hat{\rho}_r\hat{F}(Q)| + |Tr\hat{\rho}_r\hat{F}(Q) - F(Tr\hat{\rho}_r\hat{Q})| + |F(Tr\hat{\rho}_r\hat{Q}) - F(Tr\hat{\rho}\hat{Q})|$.

If ρ is in $N(\hat{\rho}_r, \hat{F}(Q), \frac{\epsilon}{3})$ the first summand is $< \frac{\epsilon}{3}$, as is the second by choice of ρ_r. The final summand is also $< \frac{\epsilon}{3}$ because
$|F(Tr\hat{\rho}_r\hat{Q}) - F(Tr\hat{\rho}\hat{Q})| \leq |F(Tr\hat{\rho}_r\hat{Q}) - F(r)| + |F(r) - F(Tr\hat{\rho}\hat{Q})|$.

Here the first summand is $< \frac{\epsilon}{6}$ by the definition of $\hat{\rho}_r$ in Definition 4. Furthermore,the second summand is $< \frac{\epsilon}{6}$ because the function F is continuous at r and with $x = Tr\hat{\rho}\hat{Q}$, $|x - r| \leq |x - Tr\hat{\rho}_r\hat{Q}| + |Tr\hat{\rho}_r\hat{Q} - r| < \frac{\delta}{2} + \frac{\delta}{2} = \delta$, because $\hat{\rho} \in W(r,\epsilon)$, and because of the choice of $\hat{\rho}_r$ in Definition 4.

Therefore, for any ρ in $W(r,\epsilon)$, $|Tr\hat{\rho}\hat{F}(Q) - F(Tr\hat{\rho}\hat{Q})| < \epsilon$. #

The question remains whether we can construct sufficiently many of these open sets. In general, for a given S-smooth function F, the family of open sets $\{W(r,\epsilon)\}$, does not form an open cover of the state space Σ. The physically important exception is the linear force law,eg simple harmonic motion, when equality holds for all ρ in Σ.

However, for every permissible F, the family of open sets $\{W(r,\epsilon)\}$ covers the classical coordinate space of the physical system in the sense that associated with each $W(r,\epsilon)$ there is an open interval $(r-\delta, r+\delta)$, with δ defined in Definition 4,such that the collection of these intervals covers the standard real line which is the classical coordinate space of this model.

If we had used three dimensions for the classical configuration space of the particle, the analog of Theorem 6 would permit us to deduce that there is a family of open sets $\{W(\vec{x},\epsilon)\}$, with $\vec{x} \in \mathbf{R^3}$,on which Heisenberg's numerical equations give a good approximation to Newton's equation. Furthermore associated to each $W(\vec{x},\epsilon)$ is an open ball $B(\vec{x},\delta)$ in $\mathbf{R^3}$, the collection of which cover $\mathbf{R^3}$. Again an observer measuring a particle with apparatus set up in one of these open balls could not determine locally whether the evolution of the particle was governed by Heisenberg's equations of motion averaged over a ρ from $W(\vec{x},\epsilon)$ or by Newtons equations of motion for the quantum numbers $\vec{Q}\mid_W$ restricted to $W(\vec{x},\epsilon)$.

It is interesting to see how these results correlate with the ideas of collimation of a particle. Take the open interval $(z_1, z_2) = (r-\delta, r+\delta)$ to be the slit through which the particle is ϵ sharp collimated. Let U be such that for all $\rho \in U$, the particle is ϵ-sharp collimated, if $\delta < m \cdot \epsilon$, where $m = 2 \cdot min(|z_1|, |z_2|)$ (see Theorem 4) and $\hat{Q}$ is taken to be $\hat{Z}$ then $W(r,\epsilon)$ is contained in U, to an extent that depends on the force F.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND REMARKS.

A. Some remarks.

a) The importance of continuity.

It is worth noting that continuity is the basic property that allows a physical theory to remain valid under slight changes (up to an ϵ) and even to be persistent in the presence of profound reformulations. In our approach, continuity was present at all levels: the deduction of the form of the unitary evolution laws and of the quantum probability rule are based on a requirement of continuity between the classical and the quantum regimes (the law of large numbers itself presupposes some kind of continuity). The basic postulate 3 reflects at the quantum level the classical properties of continuity in time of the physical magnitudes (persistence). The central role played by continuity is too often neglected or ignored in quantum mechanics. Our formulation in terms of quantum numbers helps to restore the centrality of the role played by continuity in quantum mechanics.

b) About quantum paradoxes.

Let us now quickly look at three celebrated paradoxes, the EPR, the Schrödinger cat and the quantum Zeno paradoxes using the language of quantum real numbers.

Provided we think in terms of quantum real numbers, the values taken by physical properties can always be expressed as quantum numbers and only in extreme circumstances, such as an ϵ sharp collimation, are well-approximated by standard real numbers. So we must abandon that part of our classical intuition according to which the values of quantities preexist as standard real numbers before the measurement. They only pre-exist as quantum real numbers. In our model different classical standard real number values of position can be determined by measurements on a single particle with a single quantum real number value for its position. Therefore the usual concept of localisation which refers to classical standard real number values of position needs to be reviewed in the light of the particle having quantum real values for its position. The particle may be localised in terms of the quantum real number values of its position but not localised in terms of the classical standard real number values of its position. We plan to examine the Einstein- Podolsky-Rosen paradox in detail in a future work.

A cat composed of atoms and molecules which may be localised in terms of quantum real number values but not localised in terms of classical standard real number values could as well be both living and dead to an observer if the difference between being alive and being dead is just a question of molecular configurations. In the standard theories of quantum mechanics there remains the basic problem of the quantum theory of measurement: to precisely determine the border-line that separates a measurement regime from a regime of unitary evolution. What is it that actualises potentialities? Our model provides a different way of posing the question. Do there exist Newtonian forces that when expressed in quantum real numbers allow a quantity whose quantum real number values are not ϵ sharp collimated to evolve so that its quantum real number values do become ϵ sharp collimated? It seems reasonable that such forces exist, but we do not yet have an answer to this question. Note that an equation of the kind $\mu \frac{d(Tr(\hat{Q}\hat{\rho})}{dt}) = \lambda \cdot (Tr^2\hat{\rho}\hat{Q} - Tr\hat{\rho}\hat{Q}^2)$ (with λ taken to be a positive real) makes it possible to describe the measurement (sharpening) of the observable $\hat{Q}$. However, such an evolution is nor an Hamiltonian evolution (because it introduces an arrow of time) neither a Newtonian one because it does not contain any acceleration term. It is certainly not a Schrödingerlike, unitary, evolution because it is not linear in $\hat{\rho}$. Nevertheless it is expressed solely in terms of quantum real numbers.

The quantum Zeno paradox is based on the assumptions that in a measurement the wave function collapses and that the collapse process is instantaneous. Firstly, it is worth

noting that if a chain of measuring devices is present between the observed quantum system and the human observer, as is always the case, it is clear that the measurement process is not instantaneous, a point that was made clear through our analysis of the impulsive von Neumann interaction. Beside, as we have suggested following our analysis of the proposition 4, there ought to exist dynamical forces that link the quantum real number values of physical quantities to classical values of quantities associated with the measurement apparatus and thereby cause the quantum real number values to become ϵ sharp. Such forces could be used to model measurement processes to give a quasi-dynamical description of the "collapse" in which there will be no Zeno paradox. Moreover it can be shown that, in virtue of the law of large numbers, when the number of particles of the system under observation increases, the effect of the collapse process decreases proportionnally because the Hilbertian distance between the initial state and the collapsed state decreases when N increases. Then, provided the measurement time τ is very small but not negligibly small, the change imposed during a time T by a series of $\frac{T}{\tau}$ successive measurements will become negligible in the limit of large numbers. This property is an extension of the results derived in the section 2. We plan to examine it in detail in a future work.

This section has not provided hard solutions to the paradoxes of quantum mechanics but it does outline some projects of using quantum real numbers to study and perhaps resolve them.

B. Conclusions.

In order to clarify the correspondences between conventional quantum mechanics and the quantum numbers approach,we will compare the standard axioms of quantum mechanics as they are enumerated in the text-book of Cohen-tannoudji *et al.* [4] and our basic postulates:

Standard Axioms 1, 2 and 3: 1; states are represented by rays of the Hilbert space or convex combinations of them (density matrices), 2; measurable quantities are represented by self-adjoint operators (observables) and 3; measurable values are eigenvalues of these operators (in other words, observed physical quantities belong to the spectrum of the observable under measurement).

Basic postulate 1; Physical quantities always have numerical values as quantum real numbers of the form $M_Q(U) = Tr(\hat{\rho}.\hat{M})_{\hat{\rho} \in U}$ where U is an open subset of the set of density matrices Σ, and $\hat{M}$ is a self-adjoint, continuous linear operator.Any system always has an open set of states associated with it. The measured values of a physical quantity always belong to the spectrum of the corresponding self-adjoint operator.

The standard axiom 4 in ref. [4] is the Born rule.

The Born rule is a consequence of the basic postulate 1 and basic postulate 2, the ergodicity assumption.

The standard axiom 5 [4] is the collapse hypothesis.

The collapse hypothesis, in the form of the Luders-von Neumann transformation rule (so to say in its weakest form), is a consequence of the Born rule and of our postulates 3 A and 3 B, which characterize the persistence in time of observed outcomes.

The standard axiom 6 [4] assumes that the time evolution is given by the Schrödinger equation or equivalently the Heisenberg equations for the observables.

In a dynamical model of the measurement of the position of a particle we showed how the quantum real number value of the position is forced to be an almost classical real number if we impose that it gets registered during a unitary interaction with the classical measurement apparatus, which suggests that new, non-unitray dynamics ought to be studied in the framework of the quantum real number interpretation of quantum mechanics.

Basic postulate 4 states that the position and momentum of a particle when expressed in quantum real numbers satisfy Hamiltonian/Newtonian equations of motion. Theorem 6 shows that for a certain class of forces, there are open sets of state space on which Heisenberg's equations of motion give close approximations to Newton's equation of motion in quantum real numbers. Furthermore while this class of open sets doesn't cover state space, it does cover the classical position space of the particle. Thus at every point in position space we cannot distinguish locally between the two types of dynamical motion.

We hope that the quantum real number interpretation of quantum mechanics will open the way for a deeper understanding.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

T.D. is a Postdoctoral Fellow of the Fonds voor Wetenschappelijke Onderzoek, Vlaanderen.

REFERENCES

[1] M.Adelman and J. V. Corbett: "A Sheaf Model for Intuitionistic Quantum Mechanics", Applied Categorical Structures **3** 79-104 (1995)

[2] M.Adelman and J.V. Corbett: "Quantum Mechanics as an Intuitionistic form of Classical Mechanics" to appear in Proceedings of the Centre Mathematics and its Applications, ANU, Canberra (2001).

[3] L. E. Ballentine: "Limitations of the projection postulate", Founds. Phys. **20** n° 3 (1990) 1329.

[4] C. Cohen-Tannoudji, B. Diu and F. Laloe, *Mecanique quantique*, (Hermann, Paris, 1977).

[5] G. Birkhoff and J. von Neumann: "The logic of quantum mechanics", Annals of Mathematics 37 (1936) 823.

[6] P. Busch and P. Lahti: "Individual aspects of quantum measurements" J. Phys. A: Math.Gen. **29** (1996)

[7] A. Connes, *Geometrie Non-Commutative*, (InterEditions,Paris, 1990).

[8] C. Dewndney, P.R. Holland, A. Kyprianidis and J.P. Vigier: "Spin and non-locality in quantum mechanics", Nature **336** n°6199 (1988) 536

[9] E. Farhi, J. Goldstone and S. Gutmann: "How probability arises in quantum mechanics" Ann. Phys. (NY)**192** (1989).

[10] W. Heisenberg, Zs.Phys.**33** (1925) pp879-893, translated in B. L. van der Waerden, *Sources of Quantum Mechanics*, pp261-276 (Dover, 1968).

[11] A. Heyting: "Intuitionism, an introduction" eds. North Holland, Amsterdam.(1971).

[12] D. Gutkoski and G. Masotto "An inequality stronger than Bell's inequality", *Nuov. Cim.*, **22 B**, n°1, (1974).

[13] R. B. Lindsay and H. Margenau, *Foundations of Physics*, p397 (Dover, 1957).

[14] S. MacLane and I. Moerdijk, *Sheaves in Geometry and Logic* (Springer–Verlag, New York, 1994).

[15] W. Reed and B. Simon, *Methods of Mathematical Physics I: Functional Analysis* (Academic Press, New York, 1972).

[16] J. Squires: "On an alleged "proof" of the quantum probability law" Phys. Lett. A **145**n°23 (1990).

[17] L. N. Stout, Cahiers Top. et Geom. Diff. **XVII**, 295 (1976); C. Mulvey, "Intuitionistic Algebra and Representation of Rings" in Memoirs of the AMS **148** (1974).

[18] W. Tittel, J. Brendel, H. Zbinden and N. Gisin: "Long-distance Bell-type tests using energy-time entangled photons", Phys. Rev. A **59** (1999) 4150.

[19] J. V. von Neumann: "Mathematische grundlagen der quanten-mechanik", Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1932).